



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,343	02/06/2004	Paul R. Sharps	1613370-0046 CON	6467

7590 02/27/2009
Emcore Corporation
Attention: Daniel McGlynn
1600 Eubank Blvd. SE
Albuquerque, NM 87123

EXAMINER

BARTON, JEFFREY THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1795

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/27/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/773,343	Applicant(s) SHARPS ET AL.	
	Examiner Jeffrey T. Barton	Art Unit 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 47,69 and 112-133 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 47,69 and 112-133 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 16 December 2008 has been entered.

Comments

2. The indication of allowability of claims 47 and 69 is withdrawn in view of the obviousness-type double patenting rejections made below.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 129 is objected to because of the following informalities: At line 4 of the claim, "semdiconductor" is recited, although "semiconductor" was clearly intended, and at line 6 of the claim, "biaising" is recited, although "biasing" was clearly intended. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1795

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 112-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 112, at lines 9-10, the range of “at least one layer” for the bypass diode is not supported by the specification, as originally filed. The same applies to dependent claims 113 and 114.

In claim 112, at lines 13-14, the “substantially the same composition and thickness” limitation is not supported by the specification, as originally filed. The same applies to dependent claims 113 and 114.

In claim 115, at line 15, the “substantially the same composition and thickness” limitation is not supported by the specification, as originally filed. The same applies to dependent claims 116-121.

In claim 122, at line 16, the “substantially the same composition and thickness” limitation is not supported by the specification, as originally filed. The same applies to dependent claims 123-128.

In claim 127, there is no teaching of a bypass diode comprising n- and p-type GaAs layers in an embodiment wherein the identical sequence of layers forms a bypass

Art Unit: 1795

diode in the second region (i.e. the embodiment of Figures 1-5 and paragraphs [0025]-[0052]).

In claim 129, at line 16, the “substantially the same composition and thickness” limitation is not supported by the specification, as originally filed. The same applies to dependent claims 130-133.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 112-133 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 112, at lines 13-14, it is not clear what is to be encompassed by the term “substantially the same composition and thickness”. The same applies to dependent claims 113 and 114.

In claim 115, at line 15, it is not clear what is to be encompassed by the term “substantially the same composition and thickness”. The same applies to dependent claims 116-121.

In claim 122, at line 16, it is not clear what is to be encompassed by the term “substantially the same composition and thickness”. The same applies to dependent claims 123-128.

Art Unit: 1795

In claim 129, at line 16, it is not clear what is to be encompassed by the term “substantially the same composition and thickness”. The same applies to dependent claims 130-133.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 115, 117-120, 129, and 132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boutros et al, U.S. Patent 6,635,507.

As seen in Figure 8, and with respect to independent claims 115 and 129, Boutros et al teaches a multijunction solar cell comprising a Ge substrate (802); a first region including the N and P GaAs layers (804) which form a first junction of the multijunction solar cell and the N and P GaInP layers (806) which form a second junction of the multijunction solar cell, wherein this first region includes the portion of said N and P GaAs layers (804) and the portion of the N and P GaInP layers (806) not directly below, but to the right of the GaAs cap layer. In a second region, the portions of

Art Unit: 1795

corresponding N and P GaAs layers (804) and N and P GaInP layers (806) directly below the GaAs Cap support the bypass diode (810) to protect the cell against reverse biasing (see also col. 1, lines 16-22; and col. 7, lines 47-65). With respect to claims 115 and 129, these claims require that the top layer of the top cell has a first polarity and that the bottom layer of the bypass diode has the first polarity. In Figure 8, it is the Examiner's position that the GaAs N^{++} layer can be considered to be the lower layer of the bypass diode, and thus, has the same polarity as the upper N-type GaInP layer of the upper solar cell. Indeed, as seen in Boutros et al's Figures 2A, 3A, and 4A, the bottom layer of the bypass diode (210, 310, 410) is N^{++} and is the same polarity, i.e., N-type, as the top layer (208, 308, 408) of the solar cell. With respect to claims 115 and 129, when the GaAs P^{++} layer is considered the lateral conduction layer (as per instant claims 118 and 132), then the bypass diode layers above it read on the instant etch stop layer. Alternatively, with respect to claim 119 and 129 when the GaAs Cap N^{++} layer is considered the lateral conduction layer, then the GaAs P^{++} layer reads on the instant etch stop layer. Since both the GaAs P^{++} and GaAs N^{++} layers are highly doped, the structure also meets the limitations of claim 117.

With respect to claim 120, and as clearly seen in said Figure 8, the Ge substrate (802) forms an electrical connection path between the multijunction solar cell and the bypass diode.

In an alternative with respect to claim 129, the lower portion of the sequence of layers in the first region corresponds to N and P GaAs layers (804) and N and P GaInP

Art Unit: 1795

layers (806), and the bypass diode (810) encompasses the upper portion of the sequence, located in the second region.

Since Boutros et al teaches the limitations of the instant claims, the reference is deemed to be anticipatory.

10. Claims 115-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ho et al, WO 99/62125. In particular, see Figures 12 and 14B, and page 8, lines 16-23, which teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 115, Ho et al teaches a solar cell semiconductor device (Figure 14B) comprising: a substrate (1402); a sequence of layers (1404-1414) of material deposited on said substrate, including a first region (To left of trench 1438) in which the sequence of layers of material forms a plurality of cells of a multijunction solar cell, and a second region (Below and to the right of trench 1438) in which the sequence of layers corresponding to the sequence of layers forming said cells forms a support for a bypass diode (e.g. tunnel diode layers to right of trench 1438) to protect said cell against reverse biasing; and a planar lateral conduction layer (1416) deposited over the sequence of layers in the second region for making electrical contact to an active region of said bypass diode; wherein the topmost layer of the topmost cell (1402) has a first polarity; and the bottom layer of the bypass diode (N++ tunnel diode layer 1420) has the same said first polarity as said topmost layer of said topmost cell; wherein the first region and the second region have an identical sequence of semiconductor layers (i.e. 1404-1414) where each layer in the first region has substantially the same composition

Art Unit: 1795

and thickness as the corresponding layer in the second region, subject to normal manufacturing variations, and the first region and the second region constitute an integral semiconductor body.

Regarding claim 116, Ho et al teaches a lateral conduction layer over the sequence of layers in the first region as claimed. (e.g. P++ tunnel diode layer 1418)

Regarding claim 117, layer 1418 is highly doped.

Regarding claim 118, P+ layer 1428 also reads on a highly doped lateral conduction layer, as is composed of GaAs.

Regarding claim 119, N++ tunnel diode layer 1420 reads on the instant etch stop layer.

Regarding claim 120, Ge substrate 1402 provides a conductive pathway between the solar cell and bypass diode. (Figure 14B)

Regarding claim 121, Ho et al teaches a metal layer (1440; alternatively 1442) disposed as claimed. Note that 1440 provides the instant shorting and connection functions in conjunction with 1442 and 1430

Regarding claim 122, Ho et al teaches a solar cell semiconductor device (Figure 14B) comprising: a substrate (1402); a sequence of layers (1404-1420) of semiconductor material deposited on said substrate including a first region (To left of trench 1438) in which the sequence of layers of semiconductor material forms at least one cell of a multijunction solar cell, and a second region (To right of trench 1438) in which a sequence of layers corresponding to the sequence of layers forming said at least one cell (1412-1420) forms a bypass diode that functions to protect said cell

Art Unit: 1795

against reverse biasing; and wherein the sequence of layers in the first and second regions includes a lateral conduction layer (e.g. 1418) including a first portion disposed in said first region, and a second portion disposed in said second region and physically separated from said first portion; and further wherein: the topmost layer of the topmost cell (1402) has a first polarity; the bottom layer of the bypass diode (1420) has the same polarity as said first polarity of said topmost cell; and the first region and the second region have an identical sequence of semiconductor layers where each layer in the first region has substantially the same composition and thickness as the corresponding layer in the second region, subject to normal manufacturing variations, and form an integral semiconductor body.

Regarding claim 123, layer 1418 is a highly doped P++ layer.

Regarding claim 124, P+ layer 1414 also reads on a lateral conduction layer, and is composed of GaAs.

Regarding claim 125, window layer 1416 reads on a cap layer, with lateral conduction layer 1418 disposed directly over the cap layer.

Regarding claim 126, the second portion of layer 1418 makes electrical contact with layer 1420, which is a layer of the bypass diode.

Regarding claim 127, diode 1410 includes n and p GaAs layers disposed as claimed. (1412 and 1414)

Regarding claim 128, Ho et al teaches a metal layer (1440; alternatively 1442) disposed as claimed. Note that 1440 provides the instant shorting and connection functions in conjunction with 1442 and 1430

With respect to claim 129, in addition to the disclosure cited for claim 115 above, see Ho et al's Figure 12, where there is a cascade solar cell at a lower portion, a bypass diode (1214, 1216) at an upper portion, GaAs connecting layer (1210) which reads on the instant highly conductive lateral conduction layer, and layer (1222) which corresponds to the metal layer in instant claim 130 (see also page 7, line 16). The solar cell can be multijunction (see page 5, lines 15-23), and the semiconductor layers of the cascade solar cells can be p/n or n/p.

With respect to claims 131-133, layer 1210 meets the limitations of these claims.

Since Ho et al teaches the limitations of the instant claims, the reference is deemed to be anticipatory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1795

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 121 and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boutros et al (U.S. Patent 6,635,507) as applied to claims 115, 117-120, 129, and 132 above, and further in view of Ho et al (WO 99/62125).

Boutros et al is relied upon for the reasons given above.

With respect to claims 121 and 130, Boutros et al does not specifically teach that said connecting contact (816) can be made from metal (i.e., instant metal layer).

However, as shown by reference sign (1436) in Figure 14B of Ho et al, it is well-known and conventional in the solar cell art to form connecting solar cell contacts from metal (see also page 8, lines 18-23). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have prepared Boutros et al's

Art Unit: 1795

connecting contact (816) from metal because it is well-known and conventional in the art to do so, as shown by Ho et al.

Double Patenting

15. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

16. Claims 47, 69, and 112-133 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-44 of U.S. Patent No. 7,115,811. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the '811 patent have the instant multijunction solar cell and bypass diode.

Art Unit: 1795

17. Claims 47, 69, and 112-133 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 48-66, 68-80, and 82-98 of copending Application No. 10/723,456. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because although not of the same scope as the instant claims, the claims of said copending application are anticipatory of the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

18. Claims 47, 69, and 112-133 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 11/247,828. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because note in claim 2 of said copending application wherein the sequence of layers of semiconductor material forms at least one cell of a multijunction solar cell and also forms the bypass diode.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

19. Claims 47, 69, and 112-133 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 11/280,379. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because note in claim 2 of

Art Unit: 1795

said copending application wherein the sequence of layers of semiconductor material forms at least one cell of a multijunction solar cell and also forms the bypass diode.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

20. Claims 47, 69, and 112-133 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-20 of copending Application No. 11/614,332. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because note in claim 16 of said copending application wherein the sequence of layers of semiconductor material forms at least one cell of a multijunction solar cell and also forms the bypass diode.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 16 December 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

No new arguments against the rejections previously made against claims 90-111 (Previously cancelled, and corresponding to new claims 112-133) were presented with the amendment, accordingly the rejections are maintained.

Regarding the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph, Applicant has argued repeatedly that the term “substantially” is supported by the original

Art Unit: 1795

specification, and argues that the Examiner has not met the burden for maintaining the rejection. The Examiner's position remains that there is simply no support for the broadening term "substantially" in the specification as filed, and no amount of argument will provide such support. Slight variations in thickness and composition are of course inherently present in any deposited film, and any skilled artisan reading the specification will recognize that the layers described will have such variation. However, this does not justify introduction of the unsupported term "substantially". This term opens the claim language to interpretation that is very clearly absent from the originally filed specification. If "substantially the same composition and thickness" is supported, then why wouldn't "approximately the same composition and thickness", or "similar composition and thickness"? Applicant's arguments and declaration equally apply to these broader limitations. Addition of such broadening terms unambiguously constitutes addition of new matter, and the rejection is properly maintained.

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, Applicant has argued that the claim language is clear, as "substantially the same thickness" corresponds to normal variations of up to two to three percent in composition and thickness of a compound semiconductor layer, citing Applicant's declaration. Again, the Examiner notes that there is no description of such "normal variations" in the specification as filed, and the designation of two to three percent variation in a declaration does not render the claim language definite. It is not clear how close to having the same thickness the corresponding layers must have in order to be considered to have "substantially the same thickness". There is no basis in the

Art Unit: 1795

specification as filed for interpretation of the unsupported term “substantially”, and the claims are therefore not properly defined.

It is noted that compromise language was agreed to by Applicant and the Examiner in instant claims 47 and 69, which are allowable, aside from obviousness-type double-patenting issues noted above. It is suggested that Applicant use the same language in claims 112-133 in order to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 made over the introduction of the term "substantially".

Regarding the Ho reference, Applicant has previously argued that the Office Action improperly asserts that the Ge substrate 1402 corresponds to the “top layer of a top subcell” and the claimed “substrate”. The Examiner points out in response that no recitation in the claims precludes such interpretation. There is no relationship explicitly required between “the top cell” and any previously recited “sequence of layers” or “at least one cell”.

A review of the instant case file revealed that the terminal disclaimer filed on 27 June 2006 over applications 10/723,456; 11/247,828; 10/336,247; and 11/280,379 was disapproved at the time due to the lack of correct filing dates for the '828 and '379 applications. The obviousness-type double patenting rejections over these applications were withdrawn in the subsequent office action, on the mistaken belief that the terminal disclaimer had been approved. (Note item 2 in the "Comments" section of the Office Action of 20 September 2006) Accordingly, the double-patenting rejections are made again. Note that the '247 application has issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,115,811, and that

Art Unit: 1795

this rejection is therefore no longer provisional. An additional provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection over Application 11/614,332 is also included.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Jeffrey T. Barton whose telephone number is (571)272-1307. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey T. Barton/
Examiner
Art Unit 1795

Application/Control Number: 10/773,343

Page 18

Art Unit: 1795

25 February 2009